XXXII.—*Various Notes on Humming-Birds.*
By Ernst Hartert.

Genus Glaucis.

Glaucis hirsuta is a very variable and therefore somewhat troublesome species. The sexes differ in size, but very slightly in colour. The young birds have narrower and much more pointed rectrices. There may *possibly* be some subspecific forms, but the materials available in our museums at present (and I have seen the specimens in the British Museum, in Count Berlepsch's and Boucard's collections, and in that of Mons. Simon and at Tring) do not, in my opinion, enable us to separate them. Boucard (Gen. H. B. p. 363) has kept as distinct species *G. mazeppa, lanceolata,* and *melanura,* but I quite agree with Salvin and Simon that none of these can be upheld. The characters given by Boucard to distinguish *G. lanceolata* are exactly those of a young bird, as rightly given by the same author under his generic characters. On p. 364 Boucard describes as new species *G. rojasi* from Caracas and *G. roraimæ* from Mt. Roraima. All the skins of *G. roraimæ* seem to be immature individuals and not to differ from immature *G. hirsuta* of other countries. *G. rojasi* is exactly like *G. roraimæ*: I shall therefore place both names among the already numerous synonyms of *G. hirsuta.* On p. 402, Boucard described *Glaucis columbiana,* n. sp., from Rio Dagua, in W. Colombia. This bird is very small and characterized by a uniform cinnamon under surface, and may possibly be specifically distinct. Its wing measures 53 mm. As, however, the specimens are not quite adult, this must remain an open question at present.

The type of *Rhamphodon chrysurus,* Count Berlepsch informs me, is not in the Dresden Museum; it is therefore advisable to quote this name *with a query* among the synonyms of *Glaucis dohrni,* to which it seems to belong.

Genus Phaëthornis.

Although less uniform in structure than many other genera, this genus can always easily be recognized; but the genus *Pygmornis* must undoubtedly be united with it, as it cannot be sharply separated from *Phaëthornis,* such forms as *P. squalidus,* and especially *P. rupurumii,* Bouc., completely bridging over the gap between the two groups. Salvin's treatment of the species of this somewhat difficult genus is no doubt excellent. With regard to *P. emiliæ,* however, I may say that it is impossible to draw a well-defined line between it and *P. guyi,* and that it can only rank as a subspecies of the latter.

Boucard has described several new species and split the genus up into seven genera, after the Reichenbachian and Bonapartean fashion. None of these genera have any claim to generic rank, according to the ideas of modern Trochilidists, but two of his species are excellent. With *P. emiliæ* Boucard unites *P. yaruqui,* but I think that the wholly steel-blue tail of the adult bird, the darker colour of the underparts, the presence of malar and superciliary stripes even in old birds, the whitish colour of these stripes in young birds, and other less conspicuous characters distinguish it sufficiently well. The typical *P. superciliosus* is known to Boucard only from "Guiana," while he justly separates *P. guianensis,* from several places in British Guiana, and also the birds from the Upper Amazons, under the name of *P. consobrinus.* All these three are united by Salvin under the name of *P. superciliosus.* I find that Cayenne birds (typical *P. superciliosus*) are quite distinct, being greyish brown on throat and breast, without a well-defined gular stripe, and larger. All the specimens from the Andes and the Upper Amazons are lighter below, with a more distinct gular stripe, smaller, and the bill finer. Therefore I cannot unite them with the dark *P. superciliosus* of Cayenne. The small light form from British Guiana, which Boucard named *P. guianensis,* is very similar to the Andean bird, *P. moorei,* but differs from it in being still lighter, more rusty and not so brown below, especially on the abdomen and sides of the throat. It may therefore stand as a subspecies. This is not the only case in which we have in British Guiana a form more resembling, and even hardly or not separable from, the birds of the Andes, while close by, in Cayenne, we meet with a different form.

P. longirostris I consider very closely allied to *P. moorei*, but separable not only by the colour of the rump and upper tail-coverts, the latter being rusty buff with two narrow dark bars (instead of bronze-green with rusty buff edges!), but also by its longer wings and longer bill. The female seems to be a little smaller, as is the case in *P. superciliosus*.

P. longirostris was first described in the 'Echo du Monde Savant' for 1843, no. 45, p. 1070. The only available collection of the ornithological papers in that magazine is the one belonging to the library of the Zoological Society of London. There I have looked up the original description of *P. longirostris*, and found that it was described as coming from "Guatimala," and that the article is by Mons. Delattre alone. The locality and the sentence, "Queue étagée, à pennes noires, bordées de roux," clearly show that the name *P. longirostris* belongs to the southern form, with deep rusty buff edges to the outer rectrices. This form is spread all over Central America south to North Colombia (Baranquilla, Remedios, Santa Marta), while the West-Ecuadorian bird, as shown below, is my *P. baroni*. I cannot detect any differences of importance between skins from the different parts of Central America, but Mexican specimens, of which I have a series from Chilpancingo and Jalisco, differ very conspicuously in having the outer rectrices tipped with *white*, instead of rusty buff. The tail is 3 to 5 mm. longer, the middle line of the throat lighter and therefore more conspicuous. These characters, especially the white edges to the outer rectrices, are not to be found in any of the very numerous skins from Central America which I have examined. Therefore I have no hesitation in separating the Mexican form, which I name

+ PHAËTHORNIS MEXICANUS, sp. nov.,

the type, from Dos Arroyos in Chilpancingo, being in Mr. Rothschild's Museum. The two skins from "South Mexico" in the British Museum seem to point a little towards *P. longirostris*, having a small buff spot at the base of the white tips to the outer rectrices. It is therefore possible that future researches may degrade *P. mexicanus* to subspecific rank, but it certainly cannot be confounded with *P. longirostris*. Boucard, Humm. B. 1892, p. 83, and Gen. Humm. B. p. 377, described as a new species *P. panamensis* from Panama and Veragua; but his types are the same as *P. cassini*, Lawr., a form which seems slightly richer in colour than typical *P. longirostris* from Guatemala, which, however, in my opinion, cannot be separated without much further evidence.

In 1894, in Nov. Zool. i. p. 57, I mentioned a bird shot by Mr. O. T. Baron at Naranjal, near the Rio Pescado, in Western Ecuador, as doubtfully belonging to *Phaëthornis superciliosus* (L.), and promised to "speak of this bird again." The time for this has now come, since I have been able to examine three more specimens of this bird—one more from Naranjal, one from Western Ecuador, bought as *P. superciliosus* from H. Whitely, and one from Esmeraldas, West Ecuador, formerly in Mr. Sclater's collection, now in the British Museum. This last bird is the one mentioned by Sclater in P. Z. S. 1860, p. 296, as *Phaëthornis moorii*, while in the Cat. B. xvi. p. 273 it is enumerated as specimen f' of *P. longirostris*. It is certainly neither of the two, but a distinct new species, which I wish to name

PHAËTHORNIS BARONI, sp. nov.,

in honour of Mr. Baron, who already in 1893 suggested to me that it was a new species, but I did not see sufficient evidence of it then. *P. baroni* differs from *P. longirostris* in having the tips of the outer rectrices bordered with pure white. Mr. Salvin, who does not separate the large Mexican form with the white-tipped outer rectrices, says that southern examples have these tips buff; but certainly the West-Ecuadorian birds are the southernmost ones, and yet they have these tips snow-white. Besides the different colour of the tips of the outer rectrices, the wings and tail of *P. baroni* are much shorter, the abdomen is paler and not so buff, the under tail-coverts are almost pure white, and *all* the feathers of the upper parts have pale buff edges and a narrow dark subterminal line. This last character is generally a sign of immaturity, but the four birds that I have studied are evidently fully adult specimens. The same character, though the edges are there not pale buff, but rich rusty buff, is found in the West-Ecuadorian *P. berlepschi*, E. & Cl. Hart. (Nov. Zool. i. p. 56), of which I have now seen some more skins.

In *P. baroni* the chin and middle of the throat is rusty buff, the sides of the throat rather dark: "maxilla black, mandible bright orange-red with black tips" (*Baron*). *P. baroni* differs from *P. superciliosus moorei* in having the tips of the outer rectrices bordered with pure white, in the chin and middle of the throat being clear rusty buff, all the feathers of the back having buff edges, and in the colour of the abdomen, but on the whole is, perhaps, nearer related to it than to *P. longirostris*. The measurements of the type of *P. baroni*, from Naranjal, are as follows:—Total length about 150 mm., wing 58 (59 and 60 in the others), central rectrices 68, lateral 23, exposed culmen 39.

P. bolivianus is puzzlingly near to *P. longirostris*, but unless future explorations shall show that it occurs in the long stretch of intervening countries it must be kept as a species, otherwise I should treat it as a mere subspecies.

P. apheles, Heine, J. f. O. 1884, p. 235, is, according to Berlepsch, probably a distinct species, closely allied to his *P. nattereri*, but differing in its pure black and broad subapical band to the outer rectrices, and in its shorter wings. In the 'Catalogue of Birds' I do not find it mentioned.

P. garleppi, Boucard, has been described from a duplicate specimen received from Count Berlepsch, who has a series from the same locality, and the Count informs me that he cannot distinguish his Bolivian skins from the typical *P. pretrii* from Brazil. It may therefore be dismissed without the slightest hesitation.

P. gounellei, Boucard, is a good species, nearest allied to *P. squalidus*, and not to *P. nattereri*, Berlepsch, which is also a good species and not a form of *P. pretrii*. The most obvious character of *P. nattereri* is the form and coloration of the rectrices: they are very much narrower than in *P. longuemareus,* which is of all species the nearest ally of *P. nattereri. P. rupurunii,* Bouc. (spelt *rupurumii* in the first description, Humm. B. ii. p. 1, afterwards, Gen. Hum. B. p. 384, altered into *P. rupununii* and *P. rupuninii* in the index, while the name of the river is Rupuruni), is a very distinct species of small size, the tail being in form between that of a "*Pygmornis*" and a *Phaëthornis.*

A number of additions and changes will be necessary in the group of small species generally called *Pygmornis.*

P. riojæ, Berlepsch, from North Peru, is, judging from the description, closely allied to *P. striigularis,* but differs in having a tuft of greenish-black feathers in the middle of the breast, like *P. pygmæus* and allies, while the narrow white borders to the rectrices are not a distinguishing character, being also found in fully adult specimens of *P. striigularis.*

P. chapadensis, Allen, Bull. Amer. Mus. N. H. 1893, p. 122, from Matto Grosso, is evidently the same as Berlepsch's *P. nattereri,* as a comparison of the descriptions will show at once.

Eremita whitelyi, Bouc. Gen. Humm. B. p. 390, is certainly not different from *Pygmornis episcopus.* The British Museum possesses skins from the same localities as those whence Boucard's types came.

With the best intentions to agree with the conclusions of others, I cannot possibly see that there are sufficient reasons for considering *P. viridicaudata* to be the female of *P. idaliæ.* Although the males of some species as they increase in age grow darker on their under surface, there is no case in which the male is dark grey below, the female rufous, nor has any female longer wings. The longer tail of *P. viridicaudata* is also, in my opinion, not the character of the female sex, but a specific peculiarity, as the rectrices are not rounded and broad, but pointed, and as the birds seem to be quite adult. I trust that future explorations in Brazil will confirm my view on this point, and that we shall learn the exact home of both *P. idaliæ* (=*P. obscura*) and *P. viridicaudata.*

P. nigricinctus and *P. pygmæus* can only be treated as subspecifically allied. Even in the British Museum collection we find specimens of the former from Bolivia which hardly, if at all, differ from one or two of the series of the latter species. In fact in Bolivia the somewhat intermediate forms seem to be the rule. Mr. Arthur Maxwell Stuart has sent to the Tring Museum four specimens which he shot at San Augustin, in Eastern Bolivia, at an elevation of about 3500 feet. In these four birds about one-third of the mandible is black, while in *P. pygmæus* about one-half is black, in typical *P. nigricinctus* only the utmost tip. However, this character is evidently variable, and therefore I cannot treat these Bolivian skins as belonging to an intermediate species or subspecies, as I do not see any other constant characters to separate them by.

One new species has nevertheless been discovered by Mr. A. M. Stuart in E. Bolivia, which I described as *Phaëthornis stuarti* at the April meeting of the B. O. C. (see below, p. 442). As it is, I shall now have to recognize the following forms of the genus *Phaëthornis* :—

1. *P. guyi guyi* (Less.). Coastal hill-ranges of Venezuela, Trinidad.
2. *P. guyi emiliæ* (Bourc. & Muls.). Andes, from Costa Rica to Peru.
3. *P. yaruqui* (Bourc.). Ecuador.
4. *P. superciliosus superciliosus* (L.). Cayenne.
5. *P. superciliosus guianensis* (Boucard). British Guiana.
6. *P. superciliosus moorei* (Lawr.). Eastern slopes of Andes in Colombia and Ecuador.
7. *P. baroni*, Hartert. West Ecuador.
8. *P. longirostris*, Delattre. Central America to North Colombia.
9. *P. mexicanus*, Hartert. Mexico.
10. *P. bolivianus*, Gould. Bolivia.
11. *P. hispidus* (Gould). Upper Amazons.
12. *P. syrmatophorus*, Gould. Ecuador and Cauca Valley.
13. *P. berlepschi*, Hartert. W. Ecuador.
14. *P. anthophilus* (Bourc. & Muls.). Colombia and Venezuela.
15. *P. eurynome* (Less.). Southern Brazil.
16. *P. squalidus* (Temm.). S.E. Brazil.
17. *P. gounellei*, Bouc. Brazil.
18. *P. augusti* (Bourc.). Colombia to Guiana.
19. *P. pretrii* (Less. & Delattre). Brazil.
20. *P. bourcieri* (Less.). Guiana to the Andes.

21. *P. philippi* (Bourc. & Muls.). Bolivia and Amazons Valley.
22. *P. rupurumii*, Bourc. British Guiana.
23. *P. griseigularis*, Gould. Colombia to Peru.
24. *P. riojæ*, Berlp. N. Peru.
25. *P. striigularis*, Gould. Colombia to Peru.
26. *P. adolphi*, Gould. S.E. Mexico, Central America.
27. *P. longuemareus* (Less.). Cayenne and Trinidad.
28. *P. nattereri*, Berlp. Matto Grosso.
29. *P. idaliæ* (Bourc. & Muls.). Brazil.
30. *P. viridicaudatus* (Gould). Brazil.
31. *P. episcopus*, Gould. British Guiana.
32. *P. pygmæus pygmæus* (Spix). Cayenne and Brazil.
33. *P. pygmæus nigricinctus* (Lawr.). Upper Amazonia to Bolivia.
34. *P. stuarti*, Hartert. East Bolivia.
35. *P. apheles*, Cab. North Peru.

The Catalogue of Birds enumerates 24 species of *Phaëthornis*, and one as not known to the author, while Mons. E. Simon, in 'Feuille des Jeunes Naturalistes,' 1897, p. 87, says that the genus consists of 27 species, not counting subspecies, and does not recognize Nos. 7, 9, and 34 of my list.

Genus CYANOLESBIA.

Mr. Salvin, in Cat. B. xvi. pp. 137–140, recognized four species of this genus, viz.: *C. gorgo*, from Colombia and Venezuela; *C. cœlestis*, from Colombia and Ecuador; *C. mocoa*, from Ecuador and the Cauca Valley; *C. smaragdina*, from Bolivia. Under *C. gorgo* he mentions several forms, and says: "It is quite possible that several well-marked forms are here united, but most of the specimens before me have their origin too indefinitely marked to justify my attempting their separation." This remark of the author was very true, and one may add that it is a general fault of all collections of Trochilidæ that too many specimens are "trade-skins" from the Indians of Bogotá, Guatemala, Brazil, Guiana, Cayenne, and other places. The origin of the so-called Trinidad skins is, in my opinion, not yet known at all. The grand material brought together by Buckley in Ecuador and Bolivia, too, was carelessly collected, none of his skins having labels with dates, sexes, and other details. Skins with sufficiently exact labels are comparatively rare in all collections. In view of these circumstances Mr. Salvin's caution with regard to the different forms of the *gorgo*-group of *Cyanolesbia* was wise; but soon after the appearance of his work, the great continental *Trochilidist*, our learned friend Count Berlepsch, described (J. f. O. 1892, pp. 453, 454) two distinct forms, viz.: *C. emmæ*, not rare in Bogotá collections; and *C. caudata*, from the Andes of Venezuela. A large series of skins from the coast-ranges of mountains behind Puerto Cabello, in Venezuela, enabled him also to recognize the constancy of *C. margarethæ*. In 1894 (Nov. Zool. i. p. 47) I gave a new complete key of the genus *Cyanolesbia*, including all the above forms as follows:—1. *C. griseiventris*, 2. *C. mocoa*, 3. *C. mocoa smaragdina*, 4. *C. emmæ*, 5. *C. gorgo*, 6. *C. gorgo margarethæ*, 7. *C. cœlestis*, 8. *C. caudata*.

From this view I see no reason to differ, except that I am inclined to regard forms 4, 5, 6, and 8 as only subspecifically related. Then it should be added that *C. emmæ* and *C. caudata* have been renamed—"if they should prove distinct species"—*C. columbiana* and *C. meridana* by Boucard in November, 1895 (Gen. Humm. B. pp. 97, 98), who has also very clearly stated their differences.

Genus CHRYSOLAMPIS.

Here I may mention that a carefully dissected series of *Chrysolampis mosquitus*, collected by Dr. Percy Rendall in Trinidad and Tobago, shows that my former statement ('Ibis,' 1893, p. 299), that the birds described as females are the young, and those described as young are the adult females, is quite correct. Although I knew I was right, this is worth mentioning, as somebody *might* have thought I had dissected my birds wrongly. Dr. Rendall's birds also corroborate my assertion that the old females very often have a line of glittering feathers along the throat. In fact, Dr. Rendall tells me that all fully adult females have this character.

Chrysolampis giglioli, Oust. ('Naturaliste,' 1885, p. 3), is an artefact—a *Chrysolampis* with the tail of a *Florisuga*,—as already quite correctly stated by Boucard in Gen. Humm. B. p. 57.

Genus THALURANIA.

In Nov. Zool. iv. p. 150, I mentioned that the Tring Museum had received some skins of *Thalurania balzani*, Simon, collected by Mr. Arthur Maxwell Stuart on the Beni River in Eastern Bolivia. They are five adult males, two females, and one young male. The two females, the young male, and two adult males have the under tail-coverts pure white, while the other three adult males have white under tail-coverts with dark brown centres. All these were shot at Salinas: one at Reyes, in low country on the Beni River; while at San Augustin, 3500 feet high, Mr. Stuart collected three adult males, two young males, and one female of *T. jelskii*. In all the males of that species the under tail-coverts are deep steel-blue, nearly black, with more or less conspicuous whitish edges towards the base of the longest feathers; in the female they are dark ashy with metallic green centres. The bill of *T. balzani* measures from 18–19 mm., the wing 53–54 mm., the tail (in the males) 35–38 mm.; while in the males of *T. jelskii* from San Augustin the bill is 18–18·5 mm., the wing 56–58 mm., the tail 40–43 mm. Other differences between these two birds I do not see.

Genus ERIOCNEMIS.

In Nov. Zool. i. p. 59 (1894), E. & Cl. Hartert described as a new species an *Eriocnemis evelinæ* from the Rio Pastassa in East Ecuador. When doing so they compared it with *E. godini*, and attached special value to the red base of the mandible. However, a closer study, especially of young individuals of *E. vestita* (kindly lent me by Count Berlepsch) and of *E. smaragdinipectus*, shows that the bird from the Rio Pastassa belongs to this group. In fact, it has nothing to do with *E. godini*, which is larger and does not show the bright glittering upper tail-coverts. The red base of the mandible is no doubt a sign of youth, and so is the greenish shade on the under tail-coverts. Only the very strong bronzy shade below is peculiar, but that may be either individual or a character of that age in which our specimen is. It will therefore be best to place *E. evelinæ* among the synonyms of *E. smaragdinipectus,* though we may, if we wish to be very cautious, add a query, since *E. smaragdinipectus* has not yet, to our knowledge, been met with so far east. It is also Count Berlepsch's opinion that *E. evelinæ* is only the young of *E. smaragdinipectus.*

E. aurea, A. B. Meyer (Auk, 1890, p. 315), which I have already discussed in Nov. Zool. iv. p. 148, is *no doubt* a young female of *E. cupreiventris,* for Count Berlepsch possesses Bogotá skins which are quite similar, and others which come between it and other undoubted females of *E. cupreiventris*: we may therefore, without hesitation, place *E. aurea* among the synonyms. The dark golden shade on golden-green feathers is sometimes due to skins having been relaxed and made damp for mounting.

Genus DOLEROMYIA.

We can at present only recognize one single species of this genus. I have two typical specimens of *D. pallida,* Richmond, from the island of Margarita, and after careful comparison with typical *D. fallax* from Venezuela I cannot find even the slightest difference between them. I lent one of the two Margarita skins to Mons. Eugène Simon, in Paris, and he also kindly informed me that it was indistinguishable from Venezuelan *D. fallax.* On the other hand, the two North Colombian skins in the British Museum have decidedly longer beaks ; and as also Mons. Simon wrote to me that the Colombian skin in his collection was " un peu différent " from the Venezuelan and Margarita skins, it seems probable that there is a (typical) Eastern Venezuelan and a Western Colombian form of *D. fallax.* Neither *D. fulviventris* nor *D. cervina* refer to the Colombian long-billed form ; therefore this form would require a new name if really distinct, but it requires more evidence to prove that this is the case.

Genus IOLÆMA.

A skin which agrees in every respect with the type of *I. luminosa*, Elliot, in the British Museum, is now in Mr. Rothschild's collection. It is also an immature bird like the type, and, like it, a trade-skin from a Bogotá collection.

Genus FLORISUGA.

The two species of the genus *Florisuga*, as accepted by Mr. Salvin, differ considerably in structure, for in *F. mellivora* it is not the *central rectrices* of the male that are bluish green, but the extreme upper *tail-coverts*, which almost reach the tip of the tail; whereas in *F. fusca* the two middle rectrices *are* dark green, or almost purplish, and conspicuously shorter than the rest, while the upper tail-coverts only reach the middle of the tail.

In *F. mellivora* the sexes are unlike, while they are alike in colour in *F. fusca*. The beak in the latter is slightly shorter in comparison with the size of the bird. It is therefore perhaps just as well to follow Boucard in keeping the two generically separated. Mr. Boucard has also created three new names in the genus *Florisuga* in its more restricted sense. In Humm. B. i. p. 18, he described as a new species *F. sallei*; but there is no doubt that this is not a species at all, but merely a more golden variety of *F. mellivora*, for specimens which are exactly alike occur in Brazil, Peru, Guiana, and elsewhere. The type is a not fully adult male.

Mr. Boucard has further "proposed" the names *F. guianensis* and *F. peruviana* for specimens from Guiana and Peru, "if they should prove distinct." The types of both these proposed names are somewhat immature individuals of *F. mellivora*, as shown by the greater extent of the metallic dark colour and the central rectrices, otherwise they do not differ at all.

Genus HELIANGELUS.

In this genus Mr. Boucard has described two remarkable new species. One he has called *H. henrici*; but his description appeared at the same time as Mr. Salvin's description of

H. laticlavius, which is the same bird. The number of the 'Humming Bird' in which the description of *H. henrici* appeared is dated 1st April, 1891, and it certainly came out in April. Salvin's description is in the April number of the 'Annals and Mag of Nat. Hist.,' a journal which is always in the hands of its subscribers on or soon after the first of every month. The descriptions, therefore, are exactly contemporary; and as Mr. Salvin's description was based on three skins, and Mr. Boucard's on one only, and as Mr. Salvin's type has been figured (Cat. Birds B. M. xvi. pl. v. fig. 1), we prefer to adopt his name for this distinct species.

The other species which Mr. Boucard described is *H. rotschildi* (sic), from a Bogotá collection. In this bird, with its *deep purple upperside*, the colour of the throat is of a fading golden bronze. Although the coloration of this bird is very peculiar, it is a true *Heliangelus*. In this Mons. Simon (*in litt.*) also agrees with me.

Genus POLYTMUS.

The name of *viridissimus* cannot be used for the second species described in the 'Catalogue of Birds.'

Vieillot did not give this name to the bird figured in the 'Oiseaux Dorés,' i. pl. xlii., which he mentioned in the Nouv. Dict. vii. p. 375, but identified his bird (which seems to be what we now call *P. viridissimus*) with Gmelin's *Trochilus viridissimus*. Gmelin's *T. viridissimus*, however, is not the *Oiseau-Mouche tout vert* of Audebert and Vieillot, but the *All-green Humming-Bird* of Edwards (Gleanings Nat. Hist. iii. p. 316, pl. ccclx. fig. 1) and the *Orvert* of Buffon (Ois. vi. p. 17), which Salvin quotes as a synonym of *Chlorostilbon prasinus*. It probably *is* the same as *prasinus* of Lesson, but it is without locality, and the figure and description are not exact enough to identify it with certainty with any of our recognized forms of *Chlorostilbon*. Therefore it may be better to retain the name *C. prasinus* (Less.) now in common use, although it is not much more certain than Gmelin's *viridissimus* (*cf.* Hartert, Nov. Zool. iv. pp. 150, 151).